

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 5-9, 11-15, 17-21, and 23-38 In view of the amendments and the following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's thoughtful reconsideration.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §102:** The Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 5-9, 11-15, 17-21, and 23-38 under §102(e) as being unpatentable over US Pub. 2002/0138558 to Ferlitsh.

**Claim 1** is directed to a method for providing queue management and production device status in a distributed environment and, as amended, recites the following acts:

1. placing production data received from a client in a queue, the production data including production options for a target document identified by the client;
2. generating a queue interface having user accessible controls for managing production data held in the queue, the production data to be delivered to one of a plurality of production devices;
3. presenting the queue interface to the client;
4. generating a status interface for a chosen production device selected through the queue interface; and
5. presenting the status interface to the client.

Claim 1 includes one or more acts not taught by Ferlitsh. In short Claim 1 recites presenting a queue interface, generating a status interface for a chosen production device selected through the queue interface, and then presenting the status interface. Ferlitsh does not teach or suggest this.

The Examiner mistakenly contends that Ferlitsh, paragraph [0027] teaches the acts of generating a status interface for a chosen production device selected

through the queue interface; and presenting the status interface to the client. That paragraph is reproduced as follows:

[0027] Management of print jobs includes initiating and/or receiving a broadcast that is transmitted across the network. The broadcast may be used for a variety of management purposes, including to register a client in a distributed management of print jobs, to indicate an intent to despool a print job, to set or check the status of a despoiled print job, to set or get the status of a particular printing device, to request print queue information, and/or to request a print queue change, as will be further discussed below.

Ferlitsh, paragraph [0027].

The management of print jobs referred to in this paragraph is a task performed by a client. The paragraph indicates that a management task can include getting "the status of a particular printing device." Claim 1 recites more than just getting the status of a printing device. Claim 1 recites "generating a status interface for a chosen production device selected through the queue interface" (emphasis added). While Ferlitsh mentions getting the status of a particular printing device, Ferlitsh does not indicate or suggest that it "particular printing device" is selected through a queue interface in the manner recited in Claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Claim 1 is patentable over Ferlitsh as are Claims 2-3 and 5-7 which depend from Claim 1.

**Claim 8** like Claim 1 recites presenting a queue interface, generating a status interface for a production device selected through the queue interface, and then presenting the status interface. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claim 8 and Claims 9 and 11-13 which depend from Claim 8. Claim 10 has been cancelled.

**Claim 14** is directed to a computer program product for providing queue management and production device status in a distributed environment. The product includes a computer useable medium having computer readable instructions for implementing the method of Claim 1. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claim 14 and Claims 15 and 17-19 which depend from Claim 14.

**Claim 20** is directed to a computer program product for mediating access to production devices. The product includes a computer useable medium having computer readable instructions for implementing the method of Claim 8. For at least the same reasons Claim 8 is patentable, so are Claim 20 and Claims 21 and 23-25 which depend from Claim 20. Claim 22 was cancelled.

**Claim 26** is directed to a system for providing queue management and production device status and recites elements for implementing the method of Claim 1. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claim 26 and Claims 27-31 which depend from Claim 26.

**Claim 32** is directed to a system for providing queue management and production device status and recites the following elements for implementing the method of Claim 8. For at least the same reasons Claim 8 is patentable, so are Claim 32 and Claims 33-38 which depend from Claim 32.

**CONCLUSION:** The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

Shell Sterling Simpson, et al.

By 

Jack H. McKinney  
Reg. No. 45,685

May 22, 2006

Response To Office Action  
Serial No. 09/901,974

-13-